DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 216 441 EA 014 614

AUTHOR Shakeshaft, Charol
TITLE A Framework for Studying Schools as Work Settings for Women Leaders.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrators; *Doctoral Dissertations; Educational Administration; Educational Researchers; Evaluation; Experimenter Characteristics; *Females; Feminism; Higher Education; Research Design; Researchers; Research Methodology; Research Needs; *Research Reports; Social Science Research; Student Research; *Womens Studies

ABSTRACT

This paper presents an analysis of research on women in educational administration, identifying the issues which have been treated, examining the methodological perspectives of the research, determining the quality of the research, and formulating a paradigm for future research on women in education. One hundred fourteen doctoral dissertations on women in educational administration completed and abstracted from January 1973 through January 1979 were studied. The author of a typical dissertation is a female feminist working with a male advisor. The typical dissertation investigates the profile of the woman administrator, is approximately 175 pages in length, and tests no hypotheses. The paper and pencil questionnaire survey is the primary method of data collection, with the results analyzed according to descriptive methods. The overall quality of the dissertations is not high. The lowest quality is found in the sampling plans and the highest quality in the reviews of the literature. Only 35.86 percent of the studies make an overall contribution to the literature. The only variables to have consistent relationships to the quality of the dissertations are research issues, data collection methods, and the feminist standing of the researchers. (Author/PGD).

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED216441

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charol Shakeshaft

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

A Framework for Studying Schools as Work Settings for Women Leaders

Charol Shakeshaft
School of Education
Hofstra University
Hempstead, NY 11550

Paper Presented at the
Annual Meeting
of the
American Educational Research Association

New York City

March 1982

EA 014 614

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to present an analysis of research on women in educational administration for the purposes of identifying the issues which have been treated, examining the methodological perspectives of the research, determining the quality of the research, and formulating a paradigm for future research on women in education. The major units of analysis for this inquiry are doctoral dissertations on women in educational administration completed and abstracted from January 1973 through January 1979. The final sample consists of 114 studies. The average dissertation analyzed in this study is written by a female working with a male major advisor. The researcher is a feminist and is likely to have been the only person at her university to write a dissertation on women in educational administration from 1973 through 1978. The average dissertation is likely to investigate the profile of the woman administrator, be approximately 175 pages in length, not be organized according to APA style, not test hypotheses, and to have been completed in 1976. The survey method using a paper and pencil questionnaire is the primary method of data collection and the results are most often analyzed according to the descriptive methods of frequency, percentages, or measures of central tendency. The overall quality of the dissertations is not high. The lowest quality is found in the sampling plans and the highest quality is found in the reviews of literature. Only 35.86% of the studies make an overall contribution to the literature. The only variables to have a consistent relationship to the quality of the dissertations are research issues, data collection method, and feminist standing of the researcher.

A Framework for Studying Schools as Work Settings For Women Leaders

> I cannot stress how important for the future of education... and the future of human experience it is for us to take the development and explication of a feminine perspective in educational research seriously and devote all our talents and energies collectively to its accomplishment.
>
> Jane Anton (Note 1.)

By 1982, it has become clear that women are being researched. Within a number of disciplines, the study of women has been opened for reconsideration and revision and the result was an outpouring of books and articles based upon research on women. Once ignored by the researcher, women are now the subject of numerous research studies, and hence, women's issues have become one of the fastest growing areas of research in the social sciences (Daniels, 1975). Where once such projects would have been considered unscholarly or harmful to the researcher's career, women's issues have now become respectable. "Far from being a mere 'flash in the scholar's pan,' the quantity and quality indicate that research on women will continue to flourish" (Moore & Wollitzer, 1979, p. 2).

As research on women has intensified, researchers have become increasingly concerned about how appropriate the existing research methodologies are for the study of women. In one of the earliest critiques, Carlson (1972) argued that current research paradigms, which she characterized as involving manipulation, quantification and control not only impose restraints on the understanding of female psychology, but also lead to a general impoverishment of meaningful statements about human personality. Lloyd (1976) documented the impact of societal norms on the definition of sex differences in psychology, sociology, and anthropology. She emphasized a number of methodological issues: the survival of spurious "facts" through repeated publication, the failure to report sex differences, and the consequences of employing the traditional null-hypothesis strategy. Anton echoed the inappropriateness of the null hypothesis for the study of sex differences.

> In the null hypothesis, we assume things are the same and are surprised if they turn out to be different. In research on sex differences, we should be surprised if they turn out to be the same. We should talk about not one normal distribution, but two; and develop quantitative methods for comparing, contrasting, finding, and proving similarity rather than proving differences. (1979)

Thus, within a number of disciplines, researchers are searching for a feminist perspective from which to undertake research on women. The present study extends this inquiry into the field of educational administration, which has followed the lead of the other social science disciplines in generating research on women. The bulk of this research has concentrated on treating women as a separate group--for perhaps the first time. Issues pertaining to under-representation in administrative hierarchies, the career paths of female administrators, sex discrimination in educational institutions, and methods for increasing women's participation at the decision-making level have all be treated in a number of studies. Although the woman administrator was one of the most researched topics in the discipline during the 1970s, no definitive work was undertaken to discuss the results of these studies. There are, instead, numerous studies from various disciplines on overlapping or related topics, and the ambitious researcher will find them in various journals, in research reports, and in unpublished dissertations.

Because of the quantity of reseach already done and the expectation that this is an area of inquiry ripe for further research, it becomes important to synthesize what has been undertaken, not only to know what has been done, but also to see in what direction the research is moving. In their bibliographic review of research on women administrators from 1970 to 1978, Moore and Wollitzer (1979) found fewer than 50 studies in the general literature to review. They did not attempt, however, to study the dissertation research. A search of this literature from 1973 to 1978, turns up close to 120 dissertations on the woman administrator in education. Thus, dissertations appear to be very fertile ground for the study of the administrative behavior of women in education. Dissertation literature is an appropriate genre for the integration of studies for at least two other reasons. Dissertation research, by its very nature, indicates the trends of a discipline. It reflects the newest directions and current interests within a field. A study by Campbell and Newell (1973) lends support to the idea that much of the cutting edge of educational administration research is found in the dissertation, the reason being that "professors of educational administration engage in many activities, but they appear to have little time for, or inclination toward research" (p. 138).

Because of the lack of interest in research by those who traditionally do research in a discipline, in this case, professors of educational administration, the bulk of the research in this field is done at the doctoral level or by others who are not professors. For these reasons, dissertation research appears to be an important area in which to undertake the needed synthesis of current thought on the female educational administrator. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the research that has been done on women in educational administration, the objectives being to identify the issues that have been treated, to examine the methodological perspective of the research, to determine the quality of the research, and to formulate a paradigm for future research.

Methods and Results

Sample

The major unit of analysis for this inquiry is doctoral dissertations on women in educational administration completed and abstracted from January 1973 through January 1979. These studies were located by using the usual formal and informal bibliographic search procedures; the major strategy was to systematically check volumes 33-39 of *Dissertation Abstracts International*. Titles of dissertations were sought in the index under the following headings: educational administration, female, feminine, feminism, feminist, sex, sexism, sex-role, sex role, sexuality, woman, and women. Any study that related to women administrators in any educational setting and at any level was selected. The final sample, which represents a population of all available dissertations abstracted between January 1973 and January 1979, consists of 114 studies.

Procedure

This study consists of two phases. Phase I centers on the following four questions:

(1) What topics have been researched and by whom have they been studied?

(2) What types of research designs are used in research on women in educational administration?

(3) What is the quality of the research?

(4) Are there relationships between the quality of the research, the issues addressed, and the researcher's background?

Phase II consists of the formulation of a paradigm for future research, the word *paradigm* being used to reflect its general meaning of example or pattern. In order that the four research questions might be answered, the 114 dissertations sampled were read in their entirety. A content analysis was performed on these dissertations to identify issues, trends, and methodological approaches in the research. The quality of the dissertations was then assessed through a blind review process by the researcher, using a 100 point instrument constructed from research guidelines offered by Borg and Gall (1979).

Topics Researched and By Whom

The research direction of the dissertations may be classified into six general categories: status; profiles; attitudes; barriers; leadership styles and effectiveness; and structural determinants. The breakdown of these studies by number and percentage may be found in Table 1.

Status. Studies under "status" document the number of women in administrative positions in grades from kindergarten to twelve (K-12) and in higher education. The number of women employed was recorded and the types of positions were investigated. Also covered in this category are the number of women in graduate departments of educational administration and the number of women not yet administrators who aspire to such positions.

Profiles. Dissertations under "Profiles" cover K-12 and higher education. They look at the personal histories of women in education administration and they include demographic, personality, and professional information. The career paths of the woman administrator, including her feelings of satisfaction with her job, are also profiled. Sex differences in characteristics of male and female administrators were also researched. The characteristics of specific women who have been successful in the field, as well as biographical portraits of particular women administrators, give an in-depth look at women in administration.

Attitudes. Attitudes toward women administrators are the major focus of this category. However, the attitudes of women administrators were also measured, as well as the attitudes of administrators, both female and male, toward the characteristics important if the woman administrator is to be successful. The attitudes of both male and female administrators toward legislation, particularly Title IX, are investigated. K-12 and higher education are the settings in which these studies are done.

Table 1

The Distribution of Topics Investigated Across All Cases

Topic	Number all primary topics investigated	% of all primary topics investigated	Number all secondary topics investigated	% of all secondary topics investigated
Status	8	7.02	9	26.47
Profiles	39	34.21	8	23.53
Attitudes	18	15.79	1	2.94
Barriers	28	24.56	12	35.29
Leadership Style Effectiveness	19	16.67	4	11.77
Structural Determinants	2	1.75	0	0.00
Total	114	100.00	34	100.00

Barriers. Research on barriers to women in administration may be broken into three categories: internal barriers, external barriers, and strategies for overcoming barriers. Each of these topics is explored in the dissertation research in both the settings of K-12 and higher education. Internal barriers include socialization; personality; aspiration level; individual beliefs and attitudes; motivation; and self image. External barriers researched are sex role stereotyping, sex discrimination, lack of professional preparation, and family responsibilities. Methods for overcoming these barriers include general advice, sponsorship, role models, legislation, and training.

Leadership Style and Effectiveness. These studies encompass K-12 and higher education settings as well as one research and development organization. They cover performance as perceived by subordinates, performance as perceived by superordinates, performance as perceived by self, leadership styles of female versus male administrators, and leadership styles identified as necessary for effective leadership.

Structural Determinants. There are only two studies in which research on the structure of the organization is investigated. One, at the K-12 level, looks at the organizational climate and its relationship to the leadership styles of males and females; the other investigates the place of women in the organizational structure of higher educational institutions.

Characteristics of Researchers, Institutions, and Dissertations

As might be expected, the majority of the researchers were female, and the majority of advisors male; 94% of all the dissertations were written by females, and 79% of all the major advisors were male. It is of interest to note that while none of the males who wrote dissertations on women administrators worked with women advisors, 78.5% of the females worked with male advisors. This probably reflects not so much the interest of male professors in work on women administrators, as the lack of female professors available to direct such work. It is also of interest to observe that men did not begin researching the topic of women administrators until 1976, well after the effort was begun by women. Research on women in educational administration, then, is done primarily by women but supervised by men.

The feminist leaning or persuasion of the researcher was recorded after investigating the language of the dissertation, the acknowledgements, the vita, and personal statements made. Researchers who stated that they were feminists, who listed in their vitae their membership in women's rights organizations, who used non-sexist language, or who, in their dedications or acknowledgements, made pro-feminist statements were categorized as feminists. Feminists account for 53% of the researchers while non-feminists account to 47%. None of the men were categorized as feminists while 56.1% of the women were so categorized. Additionally, 75% of those women at universities where there are women's studies programs were feminists.

About 30% of the dissertations are single efforts from one university. The remaining 70% of the dissertations, as can be seen in Table 2, originated from 30 universities each represented by two or more dissertations on women in educational administration. Of the total number of universities, 44% were affiliated with the University Council of Educational Administration (UCEA); 55% had women's studies programs at the time the dissertations were written; and 70% had women's studies programs in 1979 (when this study was undertaken). It is interesting to note that a number of the institutions at which more than one doctoral dissertation was completed had both UCEA affiliation and women's studies programs. In 1979, of the total number of universities where more than one dissertation was written, 73.3% had women's studies programs, 43% were UCEA affiliated, and 43.3% were both UCEA affiliated and had a women's studies program. Of those with only one dissertation, 54% had women's studies programs in 1979, 42% were UCEA affiliated, and 34% were both UCEA affiliated and had a women's studies program in 1979. It would appear, then, that by promoting an awareness of women's issues on a campus, women's studies programs might influence the number of dissertations written on the subject of women in educational administraion. UCEA affiliation seems to have little effect on the number of such dissertations.

The dissertations on women in educational administration are varied in orientation, as has been previously mentioned Within the six categories investigated, 37 separate variables were examined. While the length of the dissertations range from 58 to 1,261 pages, the median number of pages is 170.5. Only 18% of the dissertations are organized according to the *Publications Manual of the American Psychological Association*, the style manual used in publications of the American Educational Research Association. Hypothese were tested in only 43% of the dissertations. Examining the distribution of hypotheses testing according

Table 2

Distribution of Universities and Disciplinary Affiliation of Researchers Completing Dissertations

University	Number of Dissertations by Disciplinary Affiliation	
	Educational Administration	Other Education Disciplines
!*University of Michigan		6
! University of Southern California	6	
!*Arizona State University	2	2
Brigham Young University	4	
! University of Massachusetts	2	2
! University of California-Los Angeles	2	1
University of Miami	1	2
!*University of Minnesota	1	2
!*University of Pittsburgh	2	1
! Western Michigan University	3	
!*Boston University		2
East Texas State University		2
Fordham University		2
!*Michigan State University	2	
!*Northern Illinois University	1	1
St. Louis University	2	
U.S. International University		2
! University of Colorado		2
!*University of Connecticut	1	1
!*University of Florida	2	
University of Houston	2	
! University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign	1	1
! University of Northern Colorado	2	
!*University of Oregon	2	
! University of the Pacific		2
! University of South Carolina		2
University of Southern Mississippi	1	1
!*University of Tennessee	1	1
!*University of Wisconsin-Madison	2	
!*Wayne State University		2
Auburn University	1	
! Ball State University	1	

Table 2 (Continued)

University	Number of Dissertations by Disciplinary Affiliation: Educational Administration	Other Education Disciplines
Boston College		1
Catholic University of America		1
! C.U.N.Y. - New York		1[1]
*Columbia University	1	
Duke University		1
East Tennessee State University	1	
!* Indiana University		1
Marquette University		1
*New York University	1	
North Texas State University	1	
! Northwestern University	1	
!*Oklahoma State University	1	
!*Pennsylvania State University		1
!*Purdue University	1	
*Rutgers - New Brunswick		1
! Rutgers - Newark		1
!*S.U.N.Y. at Albany		1
!*Temple University	1	
University of Alabama	1	
University of California-Riverside		1
University of Denver		1
! University of Georgia - Athens		1
!*University of Iowa	1	
! University of Mississippi	1	
!*University of Missouri-Columbia		1
! University of Nebraska-Lincoln	1	
!*University of Oklahoma		1
University of South Dakota		1
University of Toledo		1
!*University of Utah	1	
!*University of Virginia		1
Virginia Polytechnic	1	

Table 2 (Continued)

University	Number of Dissertations by Disciplinary Affiliation	
	Educational Administration	Other Education Disciplines
!*Washington State University		1
Total	58	56

[1]Department of Sociology

Key: !Women's Studies in 1979
*UCEA Institution

to research issue, one finds that studies of leadership style and effectiveness more often test hypotheses than do studies concentrating on any of the other issues. Most of the dissertations use administrators as their primary data sources. However, faculty, students, and documents are also used with some regularity as can be seen in Table 3. The greatest number of studies are done at the K-12 level, the fewest at the community college level (Table 4).

Types of Research Design Used

Six research strategies are used in the dissertation research. The majority of the studies, as can be seen in Table 5, are surveys; 86% of the researchers used the survey strategy, five dissertations were experimental in nature, two were secondary analyses, four utilized historical strategies, and one was a case study. These findings are consistent with methodologies used generally in educational administration dissertations:

> Questionnaires are the most common data gathering procedure in graduate research on educational administration...A few years ago one study concluded that perhaps 80 percent of all educational administration dissertations completed during the period 1960-1966 relied on this technique.
> (Hauer, 1979,p.48)

Table 6 shows the different methods of data collection the researchers used, also consistent with Haller's (1979) findings of research methods in educational administration dissertations. Thirteen researchers used a combination of methods for seeking answers to their questions, and the most common combination was the use of a mailed paper and pencil questionnaire along with the interview schedule. Table 7 lists the numbers and percentages of cases according to data analysis procedure. The most common procedures were the use of descriptive methods of frequency, percentages, and measures of central tendency. Other procedures employed were bivariate, inferential and multivariate statistics. Bivariate statistics include all correlational methods. Inferential statistics are chi-square tests, t tests, and analysis of variance. Multivariate statistics include multiple regression, discriminant analysis, and factor analysis.

Table 3

Distribution of Dissertations by Data Source

Data Source	Number of Dissertations	% of All Dissertations
Faculty	14	12.0
Administrators	57	50.0
Students	2	2.0
Documents	7	6.0
Faculty and Administrators	23	20.0
Administrators and School Boards	4	4.0
Administrators and Documents	3	3.0
Faculty, Administrators, and School Boards	2	2.0
Administrators, School Boards, and Students	1	1.0
Faculty, Administrators, and Documents	1	1.0
Total	114	100.0

Table 4

Distribution of Dissertations by Educational Level Studied

Level	Number of Dissertations	% of All Dissertations
K-12	71	62.0
Community College	5	4.0
University	31	27.0
Other	1	1.0
K-12 and Community College	1	1.0
Community College and University	3	3.0
K-12, Community College, and University	1	1.0
K-12, University, and Other	1	1.0
Total	114	100.0

Table 5

Distribution of Dissertations by Research Strategy

Research Strategy	Number of Dissertations	% of All Dissertations
Survey	98	86.0
Experimental	5	4.0
Secondary Analysis	2	1.5
Historical	4	4.0
Case Study	1	1.0
Futures	2	1.5
Survey and Historical	1	1.0
Survey and Case Study	1	1.0
Total	114	100.0

Table 6

Distribution of Dissertations by
Data Collection Method

Data Collection Method	Number of Dissertations	% of All Dissertations
Interview	3	3.0
Paper and Pencil Questionnaire - Mail	76	67.0
Paper and Pencil Questionnaire - Person	14	12.0
Unobtrusive	6	5.0
Other	2	2.0
More than One	13	11.0
Total	114	100.0

Table 7

Distribution of Dissertations by Data Analysis Procedure

Procedure	Number of Dissertations	% of All Dissertations
No Statistical Analysis Used	4	3.5
Type I (Frequencies, Percentages, Measures of Central Tendency)	43	37.7
Type II (Bivariate Statistics)	1	.9
Type III (Inferential Statistics)	25	21.9
Type IV (Multivariate Statistics)	4	3.5
Types I & II	1	.9
Types I & III	18	15.8
Types I & IV	1	.9
Types II & III	4	3.5
Types II & IV	1	.9
Types III & IV	5	4.4
Types I, II, III	3	2.6
Types I, III, IV	3	2.6
Types II, III, IV	1	.9
Total	114	100.0

Quality of Research

Application of the quality instrument provides explicit scores for eight research domains of interest: quality of the abstract, review of the literature, sampling plan, instrument or survey, statistical analysis, overall research approach, sexist content, and contribution to the literature. Mean score values for each domain are given in Table 8. Each area is critiqued individually as follows:

Abstract. The absence of a full discussion of the sample, the design, and the statistical analysis is characteristic of many of the abstracts. The problem statement and the findings are usually correctly and comprehensively stated.

Review of the Literature. The reviews of the literature do not take up methodologies and instruments. In general, the reviews tend to be too broad. Many researchers treat women as a subject area rather than as a population, and thus they review literature on women in general, rather than on the topic at hand. Further, although there are a number of dissertations on the subject from 1974 onward, findings from these dissertations are generally not included in the review of the literature of the dissertations done at a later date.

Sampling. Few researchers use probability samples when conducting research, and even fewer determine or discuss their use of volunteer subjects. Additionally, very few researchers discuss the limitations of their sampling plans, the majority of which appear to be local, convenience samples.

Instrumentation or Survey. The validity and reliability of the research instrument are often not determined. Many researchers neither pretest nor pilot their surveys. Most researchers formulate their own surveys and do not look into other instruments that might be more appropriate as well as readily available. Nearly as many questionnaires as there are researchers can be found in the dissertation literature.

Statistical Analysis. The statistical analyses of the dissertations fail to measure practical significance in studies where tests of significance have been done. No study tested for the practical significance of the findings. Practical significance as referenced here is best explained by McNamara and Gill:

Table 8

Quality of Research Scores

Category	Total Possible Score	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Maximum Value	Minimum Value	Range
Abstract	15	11.08	1.96	15	6	9
Review of the Literature	15	12.59	1.43	15	9	6
Sampling Plan	15	10.81	2.33	15	5	10
Instrument	15	10.58	1.95	15	7	8
Statistical Analysis	15	12.04	1.15	15	8	7
Overall Research Approach	15	10.48	1.61	15	7	8
Sexist Content	9	7.55	1.65	9	3	6
Contribution to the Literature	1	.38	.49	1	0	1
Total Score	100	75.61	7.24	96	60	36

> Two kinds of statistical tests of particular interest to researchers are those that test for the significance of *relationships* and those that test for the significance of *differences*. To determine whether there are significant differences among two or more groups, researchers frequently employ a single-classification analysis of variance. This set of statistical decision rules allows one to specify *directly* the statistical significance associated with the test of an experimental hypothesis of interest. Practical significance, on the other hand, depends on an accurate estimate of the strength of a statistical association. The practical significance assessment usually follows the design employed in tests for the significance of relationships, and often begins by asking "How much of the variance in a criterion measure can be accounted for by a prediction measure?" (1978, p. 28).

Overall Approach. In general, the major drawback of these inquiries was the use of a questionnaire when another method for answering the question under consideration was appropriate. Thus, there is an overuse of the survey method in these dissertations. Another problem in the survey research was the failure of researchers to estimate non-repondent bias. The absence of an interview guide and failing to carry out practice interviews are major weakness in these dissertations. The concept of random selection was confused with random assignments in some of the experimental designs, and researchers did not take the limitations of the experimental design into account when generalizing. In the historical studies, secondary as opposed to primary sources were often used; and in case study research, the failure to confirm incidents with several sources was a significant limitation.

Sexist Content. When the researchers used instruments already formulated they often chose sexist instruments. The Leadership Behavior Description Question (LBDQ) and the LBDQ-XII, for instance, are sexist both in theory and construction. Using the male pronoun throughout and validated with men, these instruments have been used to judge the performance of female administrators. Sexist language, in general, is the norm in these dissertations, the male pronoun being used frequently throughout the dissertations, even when referring to the female administrator. One reason for the narrowness in language despite the healthy percentage of feminist researchers might be the reluctance of committees to approve of and support nonsexist language.

Contribution to the Literature. The first seven categories of quality evaluate methods. Evaluation of contribution explores the quality of the findings. A score of one has been given to each dissertation that contributes to the general knowledge base about women administrators. Dissertations were rated as contributing to the literature if they explored new topics, methodologies, or populations, or if they replicated an experimental study done previously. Seventy-one studies, or 62.28%, do not contribute in any substantive way to the general knowledge of women administrators since they either repeat research that has been replicated a number of times or researched trivial problems that do not contribute in any meaningful way to the overall literature on the woman administrator.

Relationships between the Quality of the Research Design, the Issues Addressed, and the Researcher's Background

Univariate analysis of variance models have been used to test relationships between the quality of research scores and several dissertation-related variables (see Table 9). The results suggest that only three variables--research issue, the feminist stance of the researcher, and data collection method--are significantly related to the quality of dissertations. The strongest relationship was found with the feminist stance of the researcher, defined previously as including researchers' statements that they are feminists, listings in vitae of membership in women's rights organizations, the use of nonsexist language, and the use of profeminist statements in the dedications and acknowledgments. Specifically, feminists are more likely to be associated with higher scores for the quality of their research. The feminist stance of the researcher is significant beyond the .0001 probability level, and the practical significance of this relationship is moderately high since it accounts for over 22% of the variance. In research on women in educational administration, then, the feminist tends to be the better researcher. While less dramatic than the variable of feminist standing, research issue and data collection method account for approximately 9% and 10% of the variance, respectively. Specifically, higher quality studies were done on the issue of barriers to women in administration and with the use of unobtrusive measures and historical techniques.

Table 9

Relationship of Variables With Quality of Research

Variable	F Value	p Value	Eta Squared
Research issue	2.117	0.0688	0.08925
Sex of researcher	0.031	0.8599	0.00028
Disciplinary affiliation	0.025	0.9749	0.00045
Degree received	1.322	0.2527	0.01166
UCEA affiliation	1.020	0.3146	0.00903
Women's studies at university	0.024	0.8781	0.00071
Women's studies at university in 1979	0.304	0.5822	0.00271
Feminist standing of researcher	32.100	0.00001	0.22276
APA style	0.857	0.3567	0.00759
Research strategy	0.996	0.4316	0.05292
Data collection method	2.296	0.0502	0.09609
Hypotheses tested	0.545	0.4514	0.00485

Discussion

Analysis of the dissertations on women in educational administration is useful for a number of reasons. First, it allows us to identify the state of the art of research on women in educational administration from the standpoint of method and issue. (For a synthesis of the research findings on women in educational administration see Shakeshaft, 1979). Secondly, it explains some of the major weaknesses of this research so that particular areas may be strengthened in future studies. Finally, an examination of what has and has not been undertaken in the research suggests some directions for future research.

The major observation that cries for discussion is the fact that these dissertations emerge from a framework primarily male-defined. That is, the research presents men and the male model as the norm and women and the female model as a deviation from the norm. Such research reconstructs reality by trying to fit the female experience into the male mold. That the dissertations in this study are of this variety, is not unexpected. After all, the majority of people doing the research on educational administration have been trained by men, and they are working with committees composed primarily of men.

Educational administration as a discipline borrows heavily both from the social sciences (Culbertson et al., 1973) and from organizational theory and research. Many observations that are believed to be true and the ways in which these truths are pursued are taken from the substance and methodologies of psychology, sociology, anthropology, and management, disciplines traditionally focused on men and male institutions, and on phenomena and areas in which men dominate (Acker & Van Houten, 1974; Weisskopf, 1978). Given this history, it is surprising that questions related to women were asked at all. However, once these questions have been asked it becomes important to examine from what perspective they spring. For instance, the research on leadership and effectiveness originates from a paradigm that is male and that attempts to determine whether women "measure up." The LBDQ, as discussed earlier, is sexist in content and seldom revised for a female population. Similarly, the work on aspiration level assumes that the desire to move from teaching into administration is somehow correct and that not to wish to make such a move is deviant behavior that must be corrected.

The male model, whether it be in leadership style or aspiration level, pervades the dissertations. Again, this is not surprising. Education generally has used questions that imply a male norm with women as deviants: "Why can't Johnny read?" not "Why can't Janie add?" and "Are women teachers and administrators feminizing our schools?" not "Are male administrators and teachers polarizing our schools and causing them to become violent places?" Beyond the fact that the male model is the norm in the dissertations, women are not investigated as populations but as topics of study, much as someone would research whales or hurricanes. As mentioned earlier, the reviews of the literature within the dissertations tend to cover any piece of literature that relates to women, whether or not it is pertinent to the subject being investigated.

One review of the literature on women school principals, for example, is more than 900 pages in length and covers topics as far afield as the history of the women's movement in England and early feminist literature. This practice illustrates how the subject of women is confounded, and it reinforces the idea that men are a population and women a deviant subject matter. Speaking for researchers, Slocum (1975) puts more succinctly the problems of bias in dissertation: "We are human beings studying other human beings, and we cannot leave ourselves out of the equation. We choose to ask certain questions and not others" (p.37). In the dissertations under discussion here, the questions asked are primarily male questions, However, it is important to note that these studies have not been useless exercises for obtaining academic degrees. Information has been gathered on the woman administrator that has previously been absent from research. Because research in the past has usually focused on the male administrator and has not looked at the female at all, these studies are important. They have brought the woman administrator into the mainstream of educational research. But where do we go from here?

In an effort to map a research direction which will allow us to understand the school as a work setting for women leaders, I am proposing six domains of inquiry. These domains are neither exclusive nor exhaustive; they are a starting point which, building upon the studies critiqued earlier in this paper, can provide data which will allow a clearer understanding of the woman leader's role in schooling.

Managerial Framework: Until recently, little work had been done which documented women's managerial tasks. The absence of studies on the actual behavior of the female administrator is consistent with the lack of such work on school administrators in general; little observational or quasi-observational research has been undertaken on principals at all. However, as can be seen from a review of the literature on principals (Tietze, Shakeshaft, & Davis, Note 2; Nagle, Gardner, Levine & Wolf, Note 3), what little has been done has been on male principals. For representative studies of this latter genre see, for instance, the work of Graves and Stroller (1953); Partin (1969); Wolcott (1973); O'Dempsey (1976); Peterson (1978); Pitner (1978); Martin (1980); and Scribner (1980). Of particular note in these studies is Wolcott's (1973) ethnographic study of a male principal which has provided one of the most continuous and potent pictures of male principal behavior available. Additionally significant are two dissertations based upon the Mintzberg framework which examined the tasks of secondary school principals (Martin, 1980) and elementary school principals (Scribner, 1980).

However, recent studies have begun to supplement and expand the literature on male principal behavior. Porter-Gehrie (Note 4) and Berman (Note 5) use the Mintzberg framework to study the worklife of women principals. Concomitantly, Pitner (1981), Wheatley (1981), and Miller and Lieberman (1982) studied actual female leadership behavior. While none of these studies tell us how women view their work nor what the social meaning of work is for them, they do begin to give us a foundation for studying and understanding the workworld of the female administrator. We at last have documentation of what women actually do when they principal or superintend. Miller and Lieberman (1982), for instance, offer the following categories as descriptive of the tasks that women principals undertake:

- Omniscient Overseer
- Confidant and Keeper of Secrets
- Sifter and Sorter of Knowledge
- Pace Setter and Routinizer
- Referee
- Linker and Broker
- Translater and Transformer
- Paper Pusher, Accountant, and Clerk
- Disciplinarian
- Scapegoat
- Educational Leader
- Moral Authority

While the studies, by and large, find that women principals participate in the same activities as do men principals, there is an indication that there are differences in style. Additionally, women would seem to take on other tasks because they are women: for instance, token speaker for women administrators, role model for women, negotiator for female authority and power. Along with additional tasks, women appear to carry out duties differently than do men. Charters and Jovick, for instance, have found that female-managed schools appear to use more participatory decision making strategies, that females were seen as more "influential with respect to the affairs of their school than male principals were", and that female principals engaged in more face-to-face communication with their teachers than did male principals (1981, p. 322). Thus, although male and female principals seem to undertake the same tasks, there is reason to believe that women negotiate their duties differently than do men; a supposition that warrants further study.

Because some of the research on the tasks of female administrators has been undertaken using a male framework and perspective (see, for instance, Pitner's study of women superintendents), it is not surprising that few differences are uncovered between the tasks of males and females. These studies have not examined activities which require women principals or superintendents to represent all womankind, nor do they explore the career-home balancing act which many women administrators must maintain. Work by Bayes and Newton (1978) has found a number of conflicts with which the woman administrator must deal and which her male counterpart does not encounter. Thus, while the domain of task is beginning to be researched, the study of the duties and roles of women administrators is by no means complete.

Sociology of Occupations Framework: Paralleling work reported by Biklen (Note 6), the seconddomain examines women administrators' work from a sociology of occupations perspective. Described by Biklen (Note 7), the sociology of occupations:

> emphasizes the importance of working to a person's self-identity; it has examined the criteria of membership in occupations; it discusses the social meaning work has for particular occupational participants; it studies work behaviors in different occupations; and it explores how occupations shape the individual identities of its members as compared with how members' characteristics shape the nature of an occupation. (p. 5)

Thus, within this framework, a number of questions arise. This is an area which has seen very little inquiry, and thus our understanding of women administrators' occupational worldview is limited. Questions which emerge from this framework include: What is the social meaning that work has for women principals? How does administration shape the identities of women principals? How do women shape the identity of the principalship? How have women changed the membership criteria of the profession? What impact have women had on the profession as role models or sponsors?

These questions are only a beginning toward an understanding of the occupation of school administrator from a female perspective.

Symbolic Interaction Framework: Related to the other frameworks and the basis of a methodological approach, the symbolic interaction framework carries with it the belief that human behavior is significantly influenced by the setting in which it occurs. From this perspective, social relations must be understood from the point of view of women leaders. Thus, questions from a female participant interpretation arise. How do schools appear to the women who administer them? How do these views differ from one administrative role to another? What do women principals see as their worksetting? Who do women principals name as their peers? What happens to schools when women become administrators?

Feminist Framework: Research which has examined women's lives has identified the need for community for women. From explorations of our past (Palmieri, 1981; Shakeshaft, Note 8; Smith-Rosenberg, 1975) to studies which explore women's values and beliefs (Biklen, Note 7; Gilligan, 1977), we find that female development embodies both care and community. Charter and Jovick (1981) describe female leadership as community building and further state that:

> ...it was because of the female principals' specific leadership qualities that their faculties exhibited higher levels of job satisfaction. Presumably, if the male administrators had been able to establish such close personal relations with teachers and had exerted as much influence over the educational affairs of the school as the women did, their faculties would have shown equally high levels of satisfaction. (p. 328)

Given the findings of Rutter, et al., (1979), Cohen (1980), and Sweeney (1982), on the relationship of community or school structure to school outcome, female community needs to be understood. Thus, a number of questions emerge from this

perspective which puts the female at the center of the inquiry. Are schools a female workplace? Is community important to women administrators? Do women administrators create community? If so, what does this community look like? If community is a component of a female workplace, how does the existence of community affect school policies, practices, and procedures; school effectiveness; and satisfaction of staff?

Revisionist Framework: This approach calls for researchers to generate additional data on women as workers within schools as well as to examine the data collected within other frameworks so that organizational theory may be rethought adding women and female experience to the equation. Women have been excluded from critical theory building studies in most fields; organizational behavior and management is no exception. The revisionist framework demands that scholars re-examine organizational theory for androcentric bias in both method and conceptualization so that these theories might be made whole. Tietze and Shakeshaft (Note 9.) have begun this process by looking at Maslow's Theory of Human Motivation and Self-Actualization and find it inadequate as a description of female development. This work must be continued into all theories of leadership behavior, motivation, school structure, satisfaction, and decision-making.

Structural Framework: The sixth research domain suggested for examination is a structural perspective which explores the effects of the structure of the organization as well as the numerical distribution of women in both administrative and teaching positions on behavior. Kanter's (1977) ovular (as opposed to seminal) study in industry began this strand of inquiry and has been continued in a school setting by Wheatley (1981). However, the questions raised are by no means answered, nor is it clear that Kanter's schema is transportable into the school world.

While research in the above six domains will not answer all our questions nor give us a total understanding of the school as a workplace for women leaders, they are a beginning toward a reconstruction of theory in which the female voice is heard.

Research Notes

1. Anton, J. The feminine perspective in educational research. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association/SIG: Research on Women and Education. Cleveland, Ohio, November 3, 1979.
2. Tietze, I., Shakeshaft, C., and Davis, B. Sexism in texts in educational administration. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Los Angeles, April 1981.
3. Nagle, L., Gardner, D., Levine, M., and Wolf, S. Sexist bias in instructional supervision textbooks. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York City, March 1982.
4. Porter-Gehrie, C. The female high school principal: Key factors in successful career advancement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, April 1979.
5. Berman, J. The managerial behavior of female high school principals: Implications for Training. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York City, March 1982.
6. Biklen, S. Autonomy and community: A study of women elementary school teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York City, March 1982.
7. Biklen, S. Autonomy in the lives of women elementary school teachers. Talk given at Hofstra University School of Education Colloquium. November 17, 1981.
8. Shakeshaft, C. Herland on the frontier: A nineteenth century women's community in Texas. In Press.
9. Tietze, I. and Shakeshaft, C. Toward a reconstruction of organizational theory: Androcentric bias in A.H. Maslow's theory of human motivation and self-actualization. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York City, March 1982.

References

Acker, J. and Van Houten, D. R. Differential recruitment and control: The sex structuring of organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, June 1974, 152-164.

Bayes, M. and Newton, P.M. Women in authority: A sociopsychological analysis. The Journal of Applied Behavior Science. 14 (1), 1978, 7-20.

Campbell, R., and Newell, L. J. A study of professors of educational administration. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1973.

Carlson, R. Understanding women: Implications for personality theory and research. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28 (2), 17-32.

Charters, W.W. Jr., and Jovick, T.D. The gender of principals and principal/teacher relations in elementary schools. Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials. New York: Academic Press, 1981, 307-332.

Cohen, M. What makes an effective school? Presentation at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, April 1980.

Culbertson, J, Farquhar, R. H., Fogarty, B. M., & Shibles, M. R. (Eds.). Social science content for preparing educational leaders. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1973.

Daniels, A. K. A survey of research concerns on women's issues. Washington D.C.: Association of American Colleges, May 1975.

Graves, W. and Stoller, N. Principals study their jobs. National Elementary Principal, October, 1953, 33, pp. 10-21.

Gilligan, C. In a different voice: Women's conception of self and morality. Harvard Educational Review, 1977, 47 (4), 481-517.

Haller, E. J. Questionnaires and the dissertation in educational administration. Educational Administration Quarterly, 1979, 15, 47-66.

Kanter, R.M. Men and women of the corporation. New York: Basic Books, 1977.

Lloyd, B. Social responsibility and research on sex differences. In B. Lloyd and J. Archer (Eds.), Exploring sex differences. New York: Academic Press, 1976.

Lockheed, M. E. and Hall K. P. Conceptualizing sex as a status characteristic: Applications to leadership training strategies. Journal of Social Issues, 32 (3), 111-124.

Martin, W.J. The managerial behavior of high school principals. (Doctoral dissertation, the Pennsylvania State University, May 1980.)

McNamara, J. F. and Gill, D. H. Practical significance in vocational education research. Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1978, 3, pp. 27-48.

Miller, L. and Lieberman, A. School leadership between the cracks. Educational Leadership, 39, (5), February 1982, 362-369.

Moore, K. M. and Wollitzer, P. A. Recent trends in research on academic women: A bibliographic review and analysis. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

O'Dempsey, K. Time analysis of administrator's work patterns and roles of high school principals. Administrative Bulletin, 1976, 8.

Palmieri, P. In Adamless Eden: A social-portrait of the academic community of Wellesley College 1975-1920. Unpublished dissertation. Harvard University, 1981.

Partin, J.L. The administrative behavior of the junior high school principal. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1969.)

Pitner, N.J. Hormones and harems: Are the activities of superintending different for a woman? Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials. New York: Academic Press. 1981. 273-296.

Rutter, M, Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., Smith, A. Fifteen thousand hours. Cambridge, Ma: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Scribner, S.A. The elementary school principalship in contrasting socio-economic communities. (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1980.)

Shakeshaft, C. Dissertation research on women in educational administration: A synthesis of findings and paradigm for future research (Doctoral dissertation, Texas A&M University, 1979)

Slocum, S. Woman the gatherer: Male bias in anthropology. In R. Reiter (Ed.), Towards an Anthropology of Women. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975.

Smith-Rosenberg, C. The female world of love and ritual: Relations between women in nineteenth century America. SIGNS, 1975, 1, 1-29.

Sweeney, J. Research synthesis on effective school leadership. Educational Leadership, 1982, 39 (5), 346-352.

Weisskopf, S. Essay reviews. Harvard Educational Review, 1978, 48 (2) 269-278.

Wheatley, M. The impact of organizational structures on issues of sex equity. Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials. New York: Academic Press, 1981, 255-272.

Wolcott, H. The Man in the Principal's Office. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1973.